

6

MODERN MEDICINE

AND

HOMŒOPATHY.

AN ADDRESS

*Delivered at the British Homœopathic Congress, held at Birmingham,
September 28th, 1870*

BY THE PRESIDENT,

J. J. DRYSDALE, M.D.,

Consulting Physician to the Liverpool Homœopathic Dispensary.

Published by Request.

HENRY TURNER & CO., 77, FLEET STREET, LONDON,
AND 41, PICCADILLY, MANCHESTER.

1870.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Wellcome Library

<https://archive.org/details/b30569989>

MODERN MEDICINE

AND

HOMŒOPATHY.

Gentlemen,—Fourteen years have now elapsed since a meeting of the general body of homœopathic practitioners such as the present has been held, and a generation has completed its term since the introduction of homœopathy into this country. It may therefore be deemed a fitting occasion to inquire how the medical profession of that first generation to whom it was presented have behaved towards it. That generation has had brought before it a law of the action of medicines which promised the discovery of their specific powers in disease, and by that means a beneficent revolution in the art of healing. At the same time evidence was given that, although the new method was comparatively in its infancy, the success already attained by it not only equalled but surpassed that of the existing methods. The public, for whom alone the medical profession exists, hear of these things, and, turning to the profession, naturally ask what is the true value of these statements, and what place this new law and practice deserves to take in the world of medicine as a whole. Hitherto, it is well known, all great discoveries have at first been pronounced upon and rejected by the medical profession without experiment or examination. That has been the invariable rule which the eager and often over-hasty adoption of small improvements rather confirms than invalidates. But surely things are changed now-a-days, since we hear nothing but boasts of the enlightenment of the men of the 19th century, and of their immense superiority to all their predecessors. Whoever is disposed to trust to this self-praise would be egregiously

deceived, for it is a painful fact that the very same course has been followed in respect to this last, and, in many respects, the greatest of medical discoveries. I am not going into details of the history of the acceptance of homœopathy, as the subject would be far too extensive for our present purpose, and, besides, they are painfully familiar to you all; but I allude to the subject in order to show how the false step taken at the very beginning has an injurious influence even now on the general progress of medicine, as well as keeping us in the apparently sectarian position into which we have been driven by the unphilosophical conduct of the majority of the medical profession. The blame rests originally on the German medical contemporaries of Hahnemann, who was a man of truly scientific mind and undoubted learning, and who addressed himself exclusively to medical men presumed capable of judging of his reasonings and testing his alleged facts. As soon as it became evident that his theories involved a very great change in medical practice, instead of continuing the discussion of them in the proper organs of scientific opinion, and testing the facts legitimately, a hasty judgment was pronounced against him, and the pages of the medical journals were closed to him. He was therefore forced to appeal to the small body of medical adherents who gathered around him, and the profession was at once divided into two parties, for which names and watchwords were speedily invented. I cannot but consider this unfortunate, and believe that if the medical profession were actuated by a higher average degree of philosophy and the sense of justice, the name of homœopathy would never have been heard of by the general public, but the true place which the doctrine is ultimately to occupy in medicine would have been worked out within the medical body unknown to the public except through the change of practice induced. In England the same course has been followed, but with an aggravation which was not seen in Germany. In point of morality the Germans do not stand higher than our countrymen, and they have shown the same injustice in condemning unheard and excluding from the medical journals all homœopathic writing, and refusing up to this day to test the practice in the public hospitals. But, probably owing to their higher intellectual culture, they have not attempted to limit the freedom of thought by refusing degrees to homœopathic candidates, or to ostracise homœopathic practitioners by refusing consultations with them

on neutral ground. These great faults, we are ashamed to see, have been committed in England, France, and America. As you are all aware, three medical corporations who have the power of giving degrees forgot their position so far as to refuse the license to practise to the candidates without an undertaking from them never to practice homœopathy, thus at one stroke degrading medicine into a sect. Soon afterwards the agitation began among the lower grades of the profession, which culminated in the famous resolutions of the British Medical Association at Brighton in 1851. This accomplished the degradation of the profession into a trades'-union in so far as the profession is held to be represented by the majority of its members. By these resolutions, as you all know, the said majority bound itself to refuse all professional intercourse with—1st, those who practised homœopathy wholly; 2nd, those who practised it partially; and 3rd, those who should, in defiance of these rules, still consult with either of the two above classes. Likewise they were bound to withdraw consultation practice from the last, and oppose to the utmost their election to posts of honour and trust. This clause requires special attention from us at present. In support of these resolutions a number of special clubs, called ethical societies, were formed, and in many of the existing medical societies the homœopathic members were expelled and bye-laws framed against their admission in future. All this time, no definition of what was meant by homœopathy was given, but any one who expressed any opinion in favour of a philosophical investigation into its merits was immediately stamped as a heretic and persecuted accordingly. As if all this were not enough, a final step even more injurious to the fair fame of the medical profession was taken in the attempt to stifle and stamp out all mention of the subject in medical literature; in short, that most effectual (if possible to carry out) of all modes of persecution was put in force, viz., the conspiracy of silence. The editors and publishers of the medical periodicals were given to understand that the slightest sign of favour, or even the commonest fairness, towards the new doctrine, was to be the signal for stopping the sale of the publication. And this was no vain threat, for, among other instances, I have been credibly informed that within one week of the publication of Sir John Forbes's article in the *British and Foreign Review*, no fewer than 1,400 persons sent orders to stop their subscription. Pressure was also brought to bear on

the booksellers, so that they were compelled to refuse to publish or even sell homœopathic books. These surprising instances of moral degradation and folly attracted the attention of the profession in Germany, and the following comment was made by the *Berliner Medicinische Central Zeitung* (an allopathic journal):—

“The agitation against homœopathy has given rise to excesses which are more than laughable—they are utterly contemptible. At the instigation of some fanatic medical men, a large publishing house (Highley and Son) have announced that henceforward they will neither publish nor sell any homœopathic works, and it is expected that other publishers will follow their example. This mode of attempting to stop the child’s mouth is absolutely revolting, and all the more barbarous as occurring in a land where the right to give expression to opinion is sacred. That it must fail to be of the slightest use is so self-evident that we cannot comprehend the blindness with which Englishmen, who are generally held to be so calculating and practical, have acted in this matter.”

These words were spoken in vain, as indeed were those of men in the highest intellectual circles in this country, including Sir Wm. Hamilton and Archbishop Whately, who publicly expressed their reprobation of the whole conduct of the majority, and denounced it as trades’-unionism. What have trades’-union cliques to do with reason or justice? Their very nature is to set such things at defiance, when in conflict with their petty interests and passions. I recall these matters unwillingly, but it is necessary, for all these restrictions are still in full force, and it is they which are now weighing heavily against the true progress of therapeutics in this country—now especially, when the practical use of the specifics, discovered solely through the homœopathic law, is beginning to be known and adopted by persons who still submit to the intellectually and morally degrading dictation of the allopathic sect. The profession was, happily, by no means unanimous in the course pursued, and there was a considerable minority who acknowledged the undignified and unphilosophical character of measures which would set bounds to the freedom of investigation in science. Among that minority it has been noticed that in each town were almost all those who had previously shown ability in the cultivation of the higher walks of medicine. The majority was mainly composed of those who follow medicine for a mere livelihood, and care nothing for science. Such

forms, unfortunately, a low stratum which embraces a large part of the medical profession. I see the *Medical Mirror* pronounces that the bulk of the profession are not gentlemen, and I fear there is too much truth in this dictum, and that a considerable number merely obtain at the medical schools a thin varnish of gentlemanly and professional feeling, which is soon rubbed off. Many were then, and probably are still, obliged to get the chief part of their income from the sale of drugs, so it is easy to see how such persons would be disposed to resist a method apparently so prejudicial to their pecuniary interests. They naturally fell an easy prey to designing demagogues, eager to obtain a temporary notoriety, and increase their chance of consultation fees by an apparent zeal for orthodoxy. It has been remarked that the leaders of the persecution were almost exclusively men not distinguished in science, but merely bold, loud, unscrupulous, and especially vulgar persons ; and it is a misfortune to any body of men to be represented by leaders who do not lead but merely seek personal notoriety by pandering to their petty prejudices and interests. One evil begets another, for the better class from whom the consulting physicians had hitherto been chosen are sorely tempted to enter in the race of bigotry and intolerance for fear of the trades'-union threat, above alluded to, being put in force against them. Some, though still, alas ! only a few, have nobly vindicated the claims of honour and conscience ; they see through the sophistical plea that there is no common ground for consultation in such different methods of treatment, and they refuse to persecute and insult the public by declining to give their aid in neutral ground, such as surgery and midwifery, on the plea that the family physician, tried and trusted probably for years, is a quack and impostor. To such men all honour is due, for their devotion to abstract principles of right and justice, while they have not the enthusiasm of positive belief in a new principle which supports us. To the other portion of the liberal party who know the right and do it not, what are we to say ? They are faithful, but not "faithful in the least." Possibly they persuade themselves that it is such a small matter that they are not called upon to sacrifice themselves in vindication of an abstract duty. Indeed, the only answers I have heard of from such men are two. One said, on application to meet a homœopathic practitioner in consultation, "Pray do not ask me. I know it is wrong to refuse ; but I have already been so badgered

and bullied on account of my opposition to the trades-union party that I am unwilling to fight the battle over again ; so I beg you will not ask me." Another bluntly said, " I know it is wrong ; but I don't choose to sacrifice my comfort and interests for homœopathy, which I don't believe in, and can't be troubled to study." It is not for us to condemn such men. We are all fallible, and possibly each of us may be acting so in things we as ignorantly deem of small import. The others, who do wrong with a high hand, we have a right to denounce in fitting terms. Such are some of the professional obstacles to the answer of the demand of the public ; what is the true position of the homœopathic law in medicine ? Against such pressure, need we wonder that the progress of the new doctrine is slow and difficult in this country ? Should we not rather wonder that so many are still found in increasing numbers to fight the battle ? I hope not, for I trust that the list of those in whom the claims of honour and conscience are paramount comprises still the great majority of the profession, though they have been betrayed into acting in the unworthy manner above described by trusting to the misrepresentations of homœopathy palmed off upon them by unscrupulous partisans, and neglecting to examine the question for themselves. We have all here passed through the same stage more or less, but have been in different ways awakened to the sense of personal responsibility which lies equally upon all medical men. In no instance has the true nature of homœopathy, and the position of the homœopaths as a scientific school, and not a sect, been displayed in such a striking and almost dramatic manner as in the conversion of Dr. Horner. That gentleman, you may remember, was physician to the Hull Infirmary, and so highly respected that he was chosen president of the British Medical Association in the year of the celebrated anti-homœopathic resolutions. In the chair he doubtless had to put them to the meeting, and also to sign them. But when the heat and noise, the stamping and confusion of the meeting were over, and he retired to solitude, then the still small voice of conscience began to be heard in this wise—Do I really know what is implied by the undefined word homœopathy ; have I taken any steps to ascertain whether it is truly "opposed to science and common sense as well as at variance with experience ?" If not, have I any right to say its professors are fools, cheats, and impostors, and ought to be cut off from all intercourse with the profession ? When asked

by the public, dare I testify to this effect without haply bearing false witness against my neighbour? This is the cardinal test to which we have all been put. No one now living discovered homœopathy for himself, nor even learned it from books alone; but we have all come in contact with some one equal, if not superior, to ourselves in ability, knowledge, and honour, who has studied the subject practically, and found a measure of practical truth therein. Could we denounce him as a quack, or meanly keep silence on the subject, or must we not examine whether things were so? As to us, so to Dr. Horner: conscience would allow no rest till he had diligently read the best accessible works on the subject. He was then astonished to find how ignorant he had been of what homœopathy really was. He next proceeded to test, by practice, the truth of the statements he had read. "In my practical inquiry," he writes, "into the powers of homœopathic remedies, I resorted to every species of proof which I could devise, and of which the subject seemed capable." The result was that in 1857 he published a pamphlet entitled "*Reasons for Adopting the Rational System of Medicine*," the rational system being what is called homœopathy, and which he continued to practise till the time of his lamented death. The immediate consequence, however, was that, like Dr. Henderson before and Dr. Reith since, he was turned out of his post in the infirmary. The experience (except, I hope, in the last matter) of every one who listens to the voice of conscience and examines the subject before condemning it, will be exactly the same as Dr. Horner's. He will find that the homœopathic body are no sectarians who blindly follow a mere dogma irrespective of the claims of all other results of scientific experiment. It is no system of covering the subjective and often trivial symptoms of disease with merely subjective and often false and ridiculous symptoms, attributed to the physiological action of medicines which are then given by sniffing a globule of the decillionth dilution, as the sole practical outcome of the physician's art. It is only possible to recognise this caricature as applied to the abuse of homœopathy, because it is the only method which takes cognizance of the relation of the minute shades of the action of medicines to those of disease. The homœopathic body are simply medical men who seek the improvement of the art of healing by studying the action of medicines on the healthy body, and applying the knowledge so gained to the treatment of disease by the homœopathic

law of specific relationship. This law applies exclusively to the vital actions of medicine when they correspond directly to the purely vital actions deranged in disease. There is, therefore, a certain field where the principle is not applicable, and there we must use and do use exactly the same remedies as other medical men. Among these are all dietetic and chemical means, evacuants, stimulants, &c., which may be needed for removing exciting causes and restoring nutrition. The boundary line between specific and other medication has not been and is not yet fixed; accordingly we are prepared to abandon attempts to treat specifically ailments which a better knowledge of their nature shows not to be within the scope of specific treatment. Of this we have several conspicuous examples. When the true nature of parasites was discovered, we at once abandoned the treatment of them exclusively as diseases, and began to give vermicide remedies in full dose. Likewise, we were among the very first to discern and adopt the use of carbolic acid and antiseptics. In the large and fatal class of zymotic diseases, although the homœopathic law applies conspicuously in their prevention, we have hitherto failed to find how the contagious principles can be adapted to the cure of the fully developed disease; and if hereafter any agents should be discovered capable of curing it by destroying the contagious matter within the body, we are prepared to adopt it with gladness, though it be not homœopathic. In short, we simply use the homœopathic principle where applicable—neither more nor less—according to the best of our ability. And in any case we simply use it because it is better than any other, and are ready to give it up for a better. We are exactly, I hope, in the position of men of true science—seeking to apply the homœopathic law wherever experience shows it to be applicable; not bound together by a sectarian dogma to be followed blindly, though we can accept no contradiction not backed by experiment. Although there are differences of opinion within our body, still I think it will be admitted by this Congress, as it is likewise by that ornament to his profession Dr. Carroll Dunham, of New York, that no more stringent tests should be given of what constitutes a homœopathist than that it is simply every one who accepts the *similia similibus* as the law of specifics. In all other respects every individual should be free to judge for himself. All acknowledge that ultimately the name of homœopathist must cease, and many think it ought to be

discarded now. On this point I would recall the opinion of the distinguished pathologist Tessier, whose adoption of our method gave such an impetus to its progress in France :—

“ Yes, we refuse, and always shall refuse, the appellation of homœopathists, because we are as adverse to the sectarian spirit as we are devoted to truth. We admit to be true the therapeutic system, invented and developed by the genius and immense labour of Hahnemann ; but just as we adhere to the psychology and physiology of St. Thomas, without calling ourselves Thomists ; just as we profess the doctrine of the essentiality of diseases, without calling ourselves essentialists ; just as we cultivate, and have always cultivated, pathological anatomy, without calling ourselves anatomical pathologists ; just as we employ auscultation and percussion, without calling ourselves auscultators and percussors ; just as we devote ourselves to clinical observation, without calling ourselves observing physicians ; and just as we study general medicine, without calling ourselves theoretic doctors, so we neither desire nor admit the appellation homœopathic applied either to ourselves or our labours. We are physicians ; and our work is to perfect the art of medicine. We admit homœopathy, because it is a great truth in therapeutics ; and we reject it in the character of a medical doctrine.”

I think we must all agree abstractedly in the propriety of these sentiments, but I fear we are bound practically to retain or rather submit to the name from motives of honour, lest we should seem even to countenance the mean subservience of certain persons who secretly adopt the fruits of the labours of our predecessors, and deny the source for fear of the threats of the trade unionists. The name also must remain for a distinctive literature as long as the exclusion of homœopathic papers and books is maintained by the allopathic journals and booksellers. I have offered frequently, and hereby renew the offer, to use any influence I may possess to stop the publication of the *British Journal of Homœopathy* as soon as freedom of publication is given to homœopathic writers in the ordinary medical journals. Of the injury done to the progress of medicine as a whole by the sectarian exclusiveness of the allopathic party I shall have to speak presently, but I may here notice that it has been equally, if not more, injurious to us to be deprived of the purifying fire of an enlarged and enlightened criticism. That has been our great want, for in a small body bound together by the ties of common suffering through perse-

cution, there is naturally too great tenderness for the individual, and much work has passed muster or even received praise which would have been sternly rejected under a system of juster criticism. I feel convinced that if Hahnemann had not been driven from writing in *Hufeland's Journal*, his *Organon* would not have assumed its present dogmatic shape, nor would he have pushed some of his more hypothetical views to those extreme lengths which have been a perpetual source of embarrassment to nearly all of us ever since. Thus, again, we see how evil begets evil, and a great part of the apparent narrowness and sectarianism of homœopathy is chargeable to the really narrow and sectarian attitude of allopathy as it writes itself down. In view of the foregoing considerations I think we may fairly claim as a body to be the only men who are in the position, according to the strict rules of philosophy, to answer the question, "What is the true place to be ultimately occupied in medicine by the homœopathic principle?" We cannot do it yet, as it requires time and numbers, and in fact the homœopathic principle can only be fully applied in proportion to the advance of general medical knowledge which culminates in semeiotics. Till we know the *ratio symptomatum* of every group of symptoms, how can we be certain that any two groups are really similar to each other? Be it remembered that it is to the pathological simile alone that the homœopathic law applies, and not to any mere superficial resemblance of a few symptoms common to many morbid states. We have, happily, enough of examples of true correspondence to prove the truth of the law of cure, and to attain to a great degree of average success in the treatment of disease. But we are as yet—medicine, as a whole, is very far as yet—from that perfection of the semeiotics, both of disease and of the physiological action of medicines, to enable us with unerring certainty to show the correspondence of the two in any given (small) number of cases. Therapeutic experiment, in the eyes of all competent judges, is surrounded with so many elements of uncertainty, that no one with any pretensions to true science will look for decisive results, especially negative ones, from a few trials. According to the well-known dictum of Andral—"With thirty or forty observations one may determine the diagnosis and pathological anatomy of a disease, but it needs years of research to arrive at a satisfactory result in therapeutics." To whom, then, is it given to try this

great question in the true temper of philosophy, viz., that which seeks truth only, and for its own sake alone? Is it to us who are no sectarians, and ready to accept any answer which nature returns to our question, and who have bought our freedom at the price of life-long persecution? or is it to those who have bound themselves by a solemn declaration that they will not look in one direction, and there is one answer they will not receive from nature? or to those, if not themselves so bound, who still fear the animosity of the sectarians and bigots? In the present state of medical literature, who would look for a statement favourable to homœopathy in any allopathic journal, but more especially in the weekly medical newspapers, viz., the *Lancet*, *Medical Times*, and *British Medical Journal*? It would be the signal for loss of sale and the immediate dismissal of the editor; and how can we expect an unbiassed judgment from an anonymous hireling, trembling for his piece of editorial bread? Likewise, no expensive medical work could at present be published if it contained anything favourable to homœopathy: accordingly the subject is entirely ignored, or, if alluded to, must be mentioned with reprobation. These books may abound in plagiarisms from our school, and its influence may be seen in every page almost, yet the subject must not be named. The private and hospital practice of a physician may display in almost every prescription the fruits of knowledge gathered by our school, and yet he dare not honourably acknowledge their source under the penalty of loss of his appointments, expulsion from some medical societies, and general professional ostracism. Are the writers in such books, and are such practitioners, in a position to weigh a difficult question like this fairly in the true philosophical temper of mind? In therapeutic experiment we may fail twenty times to get a result perfectly crucial and free from doubt, and yet succeed on the twenty-first trial. Would not a person hampered as above be sorely tempted to accept the twenty negative results as sufficient evidence to let him retain his ease and comfort, honour and emoluments with a clear conscience? It may be that in all those books, periodicals, and in medical practice, the authors and practitioners have taken such steps as to justify them in ignoring homœopathy with a clear conscience, but assuredly the onus lies on them to show that it is so. For this they have to thank the trades'-union resolutions of the British Medical Association. These remarks on the ethics of our position have extended

beyond the limits I expected to allot to them; and though the subject is far from exhausted, little time is now left for the consideration of the actual state of modern medicine in regard to homœopathy. I had intended to discuss the *bonâ fide* difficulties in the way of recognising the homœopathic law in the action of the specifics used empirically in ordinary practice, and also how far the empirical use of homœopathic remedies borrowed from us without acknowledgment, and given singly on clinical indications alone, which is becoming practised in some London hospitals, can lead to certainty in practice. This is a very interesting question, which was handled by Hahnemann in an essay which might be read with profit at this very day by any hospital physician who has begun to think on pure experiment with medicine, and hopes to find out specifics *ex usu in morbis* alone. I perceive, however, that Dr. Madden has a paper which will, no doubt, embrace this subject, and set the question in its right light both ethically and scientifically with the clearness and power which we recognise in all his papers. The other question is, I fear, too large for an occasion of this kind, so I will pass to some concluding remarks on the state of modern medicine. Nothing can be more gratifying to us than to see the direction in which medicine is now proceeding, as realising all our previsions and adopting one by one the principles and practice for which we have been contending. One by one the negative advantages of the homœopathic method have been recognised and adopted, solely owing to the influence of our example. It is true, it is alleged at the same time that we merely demonstrated them incidentally and involuntarily owing to the nihilism of our practice. But we know to the contrary, and were always able, nearly though not quite, to discriminate what was negative, while the false estimate of our practice has betrayed the sceptical school of our partial imitators into a simply expectant practice, in which mere removal of the exciting cause and the attainment of physiological rest, with the use of anodynes, is all that is attempted; so that, in fact, the physician is little better than a cook or a nurse; or else it has betrayed them into a dangerous revulsion into the stimulant practice of the Brunonians. When we look at any *résumé* of the recent progress of therapeutics we find the summing up to be excessively meagre—positively nothing but the use of antiseptics, which we adopt equally, and the discovery of new narcotics and anodynes, as if the mere palliation of suffering

was all that medicine pretended to. To be sure, there is the fashionable drug the *bromide of potassium*, which, however, is chiefly praised for its merely palliative action on the nervous centres. Beyond these no systematic gain to therapeutics can be named. But when we look into details we discover a great change going on, viz., a most extensive use of specifics, *i.e.*, medicines whose operation can be traced to no obvious physiological action taking place during the process of cure. These are generally now given unmixed, ostensibly empirically and from clinical indications alone, and in comparatively small doses; so that in some clinics we might at first sight almost fancy we had got into a homœopathic dispensary by mistake. We hear nothing, however, of homœopathy, and no reason is given for the choice of the medicine, only somehow or other it was found to be good, and is repeated empirically. What can this mean? We know very well how it was found to be good. Did the prescriber really not know, or did the above spoken-of threats induce him to keep silence? But we see also another phenomenon. For the last sixty years the homœopathic body have proclaimed incessantly the necessity of proving medicines on the healthy body. Lately, we have had this recommended, and grants of money proposed for its accomplishment, but no word of homœopathy! Moreover, it has been partially carried out, and one bulky book has been published on some medicines with no word of homœopathy except a passing sneer. It is still more remarkable that when the author comes to grapple with the results of the provings, much of his reasonings and his conclusions are found actually identical with our own; yet there is no word of homœopathy. I allude to Dr. Harley's *Old Vegetable Narcotics*. In this book the remarks on *belladonna* are especially interesting to us, for we find that the further the author advances in his study of its action on the healthy body, the more closely do his views of it approximate to those of our school. He recognises the similarity between the primary action of *belladonna* on the capillary vessels and sympathetic nerve, and the states of fever and inflammation, and, in consequence, anticipates "that its sphere of usefulness will be acknowledged before long to be co-extensive with that of acute disease itself." He then proceeds to explain and illustrate its curative action in these words:—

"The action of *belladonna* in febrile diseases is frequently attended with results which are not only unexpected, but exactly

the opposite of what is observed in health. Thus it may happen, if we give a full dose of *atropia* to a patient with a pulse of 120 and higher, a dry and hard tongue, and pupils measuring $\frac{1}{8}$, that after 10, 20, or 30 minutes, when the action of the *belladonna* is fully developed, the pulse will be decreased, the tongue be moist, and the pupils contracted. Two similar effects, the one arising from a local irritation and the other from the presence of *belladonna*, like spreading circles on a smooth sheet of water, interfere with and neutralise each other. The coincidence of the two actions and a corresponding augmentation of the effects may be possible, but this I have never witnessed. It appears, therefore, that the stimulant action of *belladonna* is converted in great measure in febrile diseases into a tonic and sedative influence."

This is simply the language of homœopathy, and is all that we have been contending for in theory and practice for years. The very illustration of the mutual extinction of waves of similar periods is one that has been used several times independently by different writers—by myself among the number in the year 1846. But, besides this, Harley dissociates the sympathetic fever from local inflammation, and maintains that it can be cured independently of the local inflammation, and on its removal the latter is quickly relieved. This, again, is nothing but the theory and daily practice of the homœopathic school. We assume to have no specifics for concrete diseases, but remedies for certain elementary morbid states, which are, as it were, dissected out by different medicines in the different phases of a disease. As, for example, *aconite* or *belladonna* is given at the early stage of inflammatory and feverish diseases, to be followed by the local specifics at later stages. It is possible Dr. Harley does not know all this. We gladly give him the benefit of the doubt, but we must remind him that the onus of disproving the charge of plagiarism always lies with the assumed re-discoverer. We hope and trust that after proper study of the question he will follow the example of Dr. Horner and Dr. Reith.